

Erik Möller, No. 2 at Wikipedia, a defender of pedophilia

Erik Möller is the deputy director at Wikipedia's nonprofit parent, the Wikimedia Foundation. As such, he oversees tech and editorial operations at the world's **most comprehensive history of obscure British contemporary art movements**. And as an editor on the site, he **takes special interest** in subjects such as "child abuse," "child sexuality," and "pedophilia." Wikipedians supposedly prize a "neutral point of view." But Möller's point of view on those subjects hardly seems neutral. Most would find it extreme. Möller **once wrote**: "What is my position on pedophilia, then? It's really simple. If the child doesn't want it, is neutral or ambiguous, it's inappropriate."

One wonders if trustees of the Sloan Foundation, which recently **donated millions to Wikipedia** after **Möller pitched them**, share his views on pedophilia. BoyLinks **finds his pro-pedophilia arguments agreeable**, as **does Martijn**, a Dutch counterpart to the North American Man-Boy Love Association.

Möller himself appears to be growing aware of the need to whitewash his history. He recently **removed** a vile image of child pornography from **his Humanist.de website**. But evidence **remains in Google's cache**.

The notion of a person with such views shaping Wikipedia's articles on "child sexuality" is unsettling enough. What critics of Möller should find equally disturbing is what, exactly Möller hopes to accomplish in his official role at Wikipedia. He has long made no secret that, like founder Jimmy Wales, he, too, wants to profit from the work of **Wikipedia's many volunteer editors**. Since January, he's been drawing a paycheck from the Wikimedia Foundation. But I doubt his financial goals end there. If Wikipedia starts selling advertising, or otherwise profiting from its users' work, will Möller argue that the site's users were asking for it?

(Photo by Leonard Witt)

LDiscuss

[Like](#) 0

43 discussions displayed because an author is participating or following a participant.

K

@



tyciolUOwen Thomas

[L](#)

I did not find any google archives image.

Troll, I do not see how you can say they clearly support it. What do you 'do about it' in regards to someone writing an essay a while ago? How is one editor's opinion on a matter, uninvolved in editing an encyclopedia, relevant to the position on the encyclopedia?

fedbait: I'd have to read the piece, but my german is rusty. That said, yeah, I'm not going to jump to conclusions without reading it nor should anyone. Troll saying that to you doesn't make sense, being a pervert apologist doesn't mean you're in NAMBLA.

Bornean, according to your disclaimer, people should not be neutral in regards to taboos because of slippery slope? That kind of reasoning has been defeated a lot these days. That said, the minority which is legal minors are kind of a common group to stick up for. Oh dear, the unintentional innuendo...

WilliamMarkFelt: I would agree with what you are intending to say, that co-operating with sexual advances does not make them fine. Sometimes, people are pressured or manipulated or exploited into co-operation. This is why only allowing informed individuals to copulate is important. That said, 'informed' is a mind thing, not an age thing. There's more accurate ways than your birth certificate to evaluate it. Accusations of witch hunting are hardly specious, they happen. I have witnessed it on the net a lot. If not witch hunting than trolling, regardless it is unwarranted emotional harassment. Your reasoning of 'even felons find them beneath them' is idiotic. Murderers in prison find everyone to be beneath them, that is why they kill people. That is why they steal from or rape people. That you care about the opinions of monsters who hurt other people in evaluating people says loads. The reason they go after pedophiles is because they are perceived as easy targets, that is all. Any perceived moral high ground is mainly an excuse for everyone to use so people will look the other way or applaud them. To indlude them that is cavemanish. My instinct tells me that Wikipedians are, on average, of higher moral character than felons, on average, so I think I'll defer to their judgement on this, thank you. Our justice system reflects this by having murder have the longest sentence, as it should, as life is the most precious thing we have. 5/29/08 10:38pm

@

WilliamMarkFeltUOwen Thomas



@fedbait - I simply can't believe me eyes. Have *you* actually read this?
"What is my position on pedophilia, then? It's really simple. If the child doesn't want it, is neutral or ambiguous, it's inappropriate. This excludes most adult/child sexual contact, but only little child/child contact."

So, you're saying that if a child wants to have sex with an adult, it's appropriate? And he goes on to say *most* adult/child sexual contact, as if *any* adult child sexual contact, is appropriate?

@fedbait, I contend that either a) you didn't read this b) you are a wikipedia defender and you see a story which just may sink this already troubled ship c) you work for Wikipedia or d) you don't have problems with adult/child sexual contact.

I'd say with any of these scenarios, especially d), it's you who have the problem. Now I'm going to love to see how Gardner, Wales, Moeller, et. al. spin their way out of this one. If I were Richard Branson, Bono, Roger McNamee, Larry Lessig, I'd slowly, quietly back away from this mess. 5/05/08 7:42pm

@

ThefieryangelUOwen Thomas



The attitude in Wikipedia (and sister organization Wikia) towards pedophilia is rather nuanced, at best. There is a sort of "don't ask, don't tell" policy towards "self-identified" pro-pedophilia activists who post there....and there have been several instances of anti-pedophilia activists who have gotten banned from the site simply by accusing people of being pro-pedophilia.

An interesting case study involving by Wikipedia content and Wikia is documented in the thread "Boy Scouts are for spanking" at the Wikipedia Review site :

[\[wikipediareview.com\]](http://wikipediareview.com)

A Wikia site devoted to spanking fetish art copied photos of actual underaged children and boyscouts from Wikimedia commons and Wikipedia. The images were freely licensed, but there was no indication that the children (or the parents of the children) had given permission for these images to be used in a sexual context. Furthermore, the photographer (who mistakenly thought that he was simply providing photos for the "boy scout" article and not porn) was not pleased to find his photos used in this context, although he could do nothing about it, since they were licensed for "all use".

...This is ONE case out of many... 5/06/08 5:02am

@

fedbaitUOwen Thomas

L

@williammarkfelt (is three names really necessary?), I fail to see why I have to conclusively prove that you're a moron, since you seem more than capable of demonstrating it without my help, but I'll give it a shot anyway.

Yes, Moller's piece leaves the door open for consenting adult-child sexual contact, which could be nothing more than allowing for the possibility of an 18-year-old (i.e. adult) and a 15-year-old (child) having a sexual relationship. Is that the end of society as we know it? Hardly.

Unlike @Ltic, I haven't done an exhaustive analysis of Moller's oeuvre, so I don't know whether he promotes sex between old people and actual children. If he does then that's clearly reprehensible, but no one has shown any conclusive evidence that he believes that. 5/06/08 9:55pm

@

WilliamMarkFeltUOwen Thomas

L

@fedbait

"since you seem more than capable of demonstrating it without my help"

How exactly? And not just me, but everyone else here as well. Remember, we're talking about Wikipedia and Wikipedians here, it's all about consensus.

"Yes, Moller's piece leaves the door open for consenting adult-child sexual contact, which could be nothing more than allowing for the possibility of an 18-year-old (i.e. adult) and a 15-year-old (child) having a sexual relationship. Is that the end of society as we know it? Hardly."

You obviously haven't read this entire piece, or the Owen Thomas's other post which continues to demonstrate Moller's defense of pedophilia. And not just the 18/15 year old scenario either.

So Fedbait, please read this:

[\[valleywag.com\]](http://valleywag.com)

Will you be so quick to defend Moller, and attack Owen Thomas, and the rest of the members of this discussion, when you read an article entitled "Children are Pornography?"

Oh and about the three names. You can do better than that, can't you? Then again, I should not expect so much from someone who uses the same playground insults I heard in the 3rd grade.

So fedbait, if this were a Wikipedia article, your edit would get reverted. 5/07/08 1:08am

@

fedbaitUOwen Thomas

L

@WilliamMarkFelt — your lame grammatical jab doesn't even deserve a response.

As for the "Children are pornography" article, it seems obvious that you and Owen and the Troll are so busy getting your torches lit for the Moller witch-hunt that you can't be bothered to read past the headline.

Unlike you, I spent some time trying to make my way through a bad translation from German and actually understand what he was writing, and it's clear to me that the phrase "children are pornography" was Moller's characterization of the approach taken by the German officials he describes in the article — who are talking about somehow indexing and regulating **all** photos of naked children just in case they might be used by pedophiles.

That helps support your case about as much as that ridiculous WorldNetDaily article Owen has linked to. Pathetic. 5/08/08 1:23pm

@

WilliamMarkFeltUOwen Thomas

L

@fedbait - if you're going to accuse someone of deficient intelligence, one must use proper 3rd grade grammar.

Oh and I read the entire translation yes, and I personally find it strange that unless someone is showing pictures of say their baby getting a bath, I don't know why anyone would ever have pictures of naked children.

Experts have determined, not 20 year old kids with agendas, experts have determined that most people who view pictures of naked children do so with prurient interest.

You say this is a witch-hunt against Moller, while he accuses the German government of witch-hunting people with pictures of naked children. It seems to me that "witch-hunt" is a specious, default argument given to people who disagree with someone.

Given Erik's keen interest in pedophilia, his numerous edits on the "child sexual abuse" article, and numerous other examples enumerated here, it seems to me that Erik is kinda fixated on a topic that is one of the last things people consider shocking, immoral and reprehensible.

And you fedbait, seem bent on defending him.

It's common knowledge that amongst rapists, murderers, and thieves, the lowliest of the low on the criminal totem pole are pedophiles. Pedophiles generally have to spend their time in solitary confinement, otherwise they're killed by other convicted felons. Moral of the story? Even felons find pedophilia beneath them.

Yet many Wikipedians, many, including you, seem to think it's just fine.

Pathetic. 5/08/08 1:43pm

@

LticUOwen Thomas

L

Wow, guess we now can understand the reason for hiring Erik — People tend to like to be around people to whom they can relate — Erik and Jimmy are essentially two-of-a-kind. Jimbo who has been (and probably would still be considered) a pornographer and who is reported to dress his wife up in school-girl outfits for his fantasies. Then there is Erik who has no such compunction to actually use adults for his pornography ... and appears not to see anything wrong with kiddie porn. 5/05/08 6:05pm

@

fedbaitUOwen Thomas

L

Have any of you morons actually read the piece Owen links to? It's abundantly obvious that Moller is talking about sexual behaviour **between children** and not between adults and children. As for the link to his writings at Boylink, that same page has links to articles at Salon and other news sites as well. Are they all defenders of pedophilia too?

Come on, Owen. Do you guys hate Jimmy Wales so much that you need to come up with this kind of crap? 5/05/08 7:20pm
@

LticUOwen Thomas

L

Actually, it is my understanding that Erik does not have any problem with sexual relations between consenting "partners". Erik does not believe in the concept of "age of consent". His beliefs are that children are perfectly capable of deciding for themselves. So regardless of age, children should be able to decide with whom to have sexual relations ... regardless of the other person's age. That sounds a bit like pedophilia to me ... how 'bout you Fedbait? 5/05/08 9:16pm